

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 25 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24 and 25, and objected to claims 4, 10, 16 and 23. The Examiner also objected to the specification and drawings.

**The Objection to the Specification**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because it fails to mention the “reply” recited in claims 17 and 18. By this amendment, claims 17 and 18 have been canceled.

**The Objection to the Drawings**

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figures 1-4 for not containing a “Prior Art” legend. Applicants submit for the Examiner’s approval amended Figures 1-4 containing the legend “Prior Art” and will provide formal drawings incorporating this legend upon approval by the Examiner.

**The Objections to the Claims**

On pages 2-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4, 10, 13, 16 and 23 for various reasons. The claims have been amended, based on the Examiner’s comments, to overcome these objections.

**Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §112**

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 18 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15, 17, 18 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 17, 18, and 24 have been canceled. Claim 15 has been amended to properly define the claimed subject matter. Applicant submits that this overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112.

**Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103**

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,457,009 to Bollay ("Bollay").

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 12, 19 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bollay in view of the admitted prior art ("Admission").

**Allowable Subject Matter**

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 4, 10, 16 and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten

in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 4, 10, 16, and 23, respectively. In addition, claims 1 and 7, as amended, now claim the inclusion of a temporary prefix to more definitively claim an aspect of the present invention. Accordingly, it is submitted that all claims are in allowable condition.


**Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Enclosed herewith, in triplicate, is a Petition for extension of time to respond to the Examiner's Action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

JUNE 14, 2004  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire  
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP  
2600 ARAMARK Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189